



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# Advocate of Peace

VOL. LXXXI

NOVEMBER, 1919

NUMBER 11

## ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

Assist. Editor, GEO. P. MORRIS

Published since 1834 by

### THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

(1815-1828)

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable Address, "Ampax, Washington")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate Subscription Price, \$1.00 a year. Single copies, ten cents each.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized August 10, 1918.

*It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.*

## OUR WAY OUT—A CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONS

WHAT is now seen to have been inevitable from the outset has happened. The Paris plans for a League to Enforce Peace, like all similar plans heretofore in history, have gone awry. Readers familiar with the ADVOCATE OF PEACE will understand something of the reasons. A League to Enforce Peace never has succeeded; we believe it never can. As we have frequently argued, it is a contradiction in terms, and it has, in it from the outset the canker of failure. Laws can provide for the coercion of individuals; but there is but one way to coerce a State, and that is by war. Nations cannot be expected to set over themselves voluntarily the machinery of organized warfare, controlled by foreigners, and operative at any time against themselves. The League of Nations as proposed out of the Paris Conference, a scheme which for all practical purposes has been defeated in the United States Senate, represents, we may believe, the last attempt on the part of the nations to set up such an organ, because it is now seen to be wrong in principle, contrary to the teachings of history, and dangerous to the peace of the world.

And yet the Covenant of the League of Nations brought to America by President Wilson has already rendered the greatest possible benefit to the cause of

international peace. Prior to 1914, there was in America little appreciation of other nations, because, outside of a very limited group, there was small knowledge of facts relating to conditions abroad. To be sure, the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 had received no little attention from our State Department, in a measure from the press; and especially from the Mohonk Conferences, the American Society of International Law, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, from the five American Peace Congresses initiated by the American Peace Society, from the ADVOCATE OF PEACE. In consequence there was a measure of informed opinion in America; but that information was, unfortunately, confined to the few. The discussion about the League of Nations has changed all that. We believe the hope now of a practical international co-operative effort lies in the direction of a Third Hague Conference. That there is now hope for such a conference lies in the fact that, thanks to the Covenant of the League of Nations and to the United States Senate, there is at last a widely educated body of public opinion in America concerning the aims, methods, and possibilities of a rational international organization. There are ninety-six men in the United States Senate quite fully informed in all such matters. The members of Congress cannot possibly have escaped learning many things about international affairs heretofore unfamiliar to them. Our newspapers and magazines have given to us all in America a new vision and a new body of opinion about nations outside our own. This educated intelligence, not confined to our own country, is the hope of the peace of the world.

If, in 1899, the nations of the earth could meet, pass laws for themselves, set up an international tribunal which has already settled some eighteen international difficulties; if, in 1907, practically all of the nations of the earth could meet, adopt laws for themselves and agree with practical unanimity upon the principle that nations rest upon law, and that the peace of the world depends upon the judicial settlement of international disputes; if they could agree then, as they did, that there should be periodic Hague conferences, and plan, as many of them did, for a third such conference, it would for these reasons seem the part of ordinary sense to take up the international problem of solving international disputes where it was left off in 1907.

The peace of the world depends upon the society of

all the nations governing themselves by mutual consent under law. There is no other way.

A Third Hague Conference certainly a conference of the society of all the nations, is therefore not only the natural next step in the evolution of international co-operation, it is the inevitable step. There is already much ground broken for such a conference. With all the history at hand, and with all the benefits of the limitless discussions over the Paris treaty fresh in our minds, such a conference might well be called within a year.

The final act of the Peace Conference of 1907 recommended to the powers the assembling of a Third Peace Conference, and called the attention of the powers to the necessity of preparing a program for such a conference a sufficient time in advance to insure its deliberations being conducted with the necessary authority and expedition. To this end the Conference recommended the selection of a preparatory committee by the governments, which committee should be charged with the task of collecting the various proposals to be submitted to the committee, and ascertaining what subjects were ripe for embodiment in an international regulation, and of preparing a program which the governments should decide upon in sufficient time to enable it to be carefully examined by the countries interested. This committee, the suggestion continued, should further be entrusted with the task of proposing a system of organization and procedure for the Conference itself.

Acting upon this recommendation, President Taft appointed an Advisory Committee to the United States, which committee submitted, in June, 1912, an elaborate and suggestive program as a basis of recommendation by the United States to such a preparatory committee. This report is still in the State Department. December 10, 1913, Elihu Root, speaking for a number of others, some of whom had taken part in the Hague conferences, wrote the Secretary of State urging "greater activity of preparation on the part of other powers." In his letter Mr. Root pointed out that the proposal for periodic conferences was American in its origin, and that the United States, accordingly, is especially interested that future conferences should take place automatically. Mr. Root urged the selection by the United States of its member of the international committee provided for by the final act of 1907, and pointed out that if that were done, "The United States would be free from any imputation of lack of interest in this step which so great a proportion of the people of our country regard as of the highest importance." As a result of this suggestion from Mr. Root, President Wilson, in a letter by the Secretary of State, January 31, 1914, instructed the diplomatic officers of the United States accredited to the governments which took part in the second international peace

conference at the Hague, to "propose to the governments to which you are respectfully accredited, that the duties of the international preparatory committee shall be committed to the Administrative Council of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, this Council being composed of the Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs and the diplomatic representatives of the contracting powers accredited to The Hague. To this Council the task of preparation for the conference may readily and appropriately be committed. The place at which the Council sits leaves nothing to be desired from the point of view of convenience, while the entrusting of the work to a competent body already in existence would result in an appreciable saving both in time and in expense. If the membership of the Council were found to be too large for the efficient carrying on of the work in detail, this difficulty could at once be solved by the appointment of subcommittees to deal with particular subjects."

February 5, 1914, the United States Government announced that it had taken steps toward the calling of a Third Hague Conference to meet in the summer of 1915. Communications were opened with the Dutch Government to that end. A Citizens' National Committee was formed to support the action of the government. On the 19th of March, 1914, a resolution was favorably reported to the House of Representatives by the Foreign Affairs Committee, calling upon the Secretary of State to advise the House of Representatives what steps had been taken toward the calling of a Third Hague Conference. On the 28th of May, 1914, Hon. Andrew D. White, speaking at the Twentieth Mohonk Conference, made an impassioned and reasoned speech, urging the importance of calling a Third Hague Conference. July 2, the Dutch Government invited the nations which took part in the Second Hague Conference to choose delegates to serve on a committee to arrange the program of the Third Conference. A meeting of this committee was called for June, 1915.

The principle of the Root Arbitration treaties is still active. The treaties embodying the principle of delay in case of disputes between this country and twenty-one other nations are still in force. Peace can rest securely only upon the judicial settlement of international disputes. These great principles salvaged from the war indicate the direction for advance. They are highly important matters for the early consideration of the Society of Nations.

These familiar facts are enumerated here because they indicate in a measure America's most intelligent interest in the cause of an international effort to establish a peace of justice between the nations.

With the rich history of those conferences to inspire us; with the reasons for the failure of the Paris Con-

ference to warn us; with the great body of informed public opinion, not only in this country, but everywhere, to point the way; with the problem of peace of the world most vitally to the front among the aspirations of men, our personal view is that the United States Congress should request the President of the United States to enter again into communication with foreign governments looking toward the earliest possible meeting of a Third Hague Peace Conference.

## AMERICA'S MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

UP TO November 8 more than one-fourth of all the officers of the American combatant forces in Europe who were in the Regular Army when the armistice was signed had resigned, and scores of other resignations were awaiting the action of the President and the Secretary of War. In the last two years 169 West Point students have resigned ere completing their courses. A similar trend of like dimensions has been noted in connection with the Naval Academy midshipmen at Annapolis.

Acts, formal and informal, words both subtle and bold, indicate that rancorous feeling of the deepest kind exists between Regular Army officers graduated at West Point, on the one hand, and officers from the former National Guard and civilians who attained commands for sheer merit as soldiers.

As for legislation before Congress defining the future size, make-up, and terms of enlistment and pay of the National Army, it is clear that it will be a civilian solution of marked differences of opinion between the Secretary of War and the General Staff urging a major program and General Pershing and men who have fought with and under him abroad opposing it. They agree as to the "necessity" of some form of universal military training, but differ when it comes to its kind and the term of conscription necessary to make it effective.

If to these facts there be added the equally significant information that recruiting for the navy and for the Regular Army is far from satisfactory to the government authorities, and that the States in a majority of cases have made no start in creating bodies of trained men who will take the place of the old National Guard, then it is safe to infer that societies organized to fan the flames of militarism in the United States are not succeeding in a way to cheer them up. It would seem to be true that the United States has learned something from its experience of war that makes it quite unwilling to provide either men or taxes with which to execute the will of the bellicose minority.

We are impressed with the fact that appointments to West Point now go a begging in many of the States;

that the demand goes up—and is conceded to be legitimate by General Pershing, a graduate—that the curriculum, ideals, and methods of this institution be modified so as to meet contemporary demands, and that its students during the last of the course be brought in touch with the rank and file of the army and with the outer public, so that it may lose its hitherto-intensified caste feeling, and have its professional haughtiness curbed and its fighting efficiency increased, if fight it must. If these changes are made, then there will be fewer cruel court-martial verdicts than are admitted to have been rendered in the recent war, fewer clashes between volunteer and drafted soldiers and their superiors based on the blindness of the latter to ideals and methods of democracy that may conflict with military discipline, and a democratic army may have a body of officers who will be respected, if not loved, by the rank and file when the call to arms comes, if come it must.

If Congress settles on a permanent army of 250,000, which is the minimum named by military experts, it will not get volunteers in that number; nor will a law providing for even a minimum period of universal military training be found workable, if it is passed. A popular referendum would defeat it. The United States is not going to put on clothes of a fashion that Europe has decided to strip off as fast as she can.

## AN INDICATION OF THE INEVITABLE

THE reports out of Paris, too meager for details, indicate, however, that the draft of the Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Nations, supported by the American Peace Society as a basis for a future code of international law, is at last before the International Juridical Union created in Paris last May, a Union comprising forty members of various nationalities. At the opening session of the Union, held in Paris November 8, and presided over by Leon Bourgeois, the French member of the council of the League of Nations and honorary president of the Union, the Rights and Duties of Nations, set forth on the second page of the front cover of this magazine since America entered the war, were presented as a basis for a future code of international law. The cables announce that it is proposed to follow this declaration with a draft of international law which will be submitted to the various governments or to the League of Nations for approval. This unofficial body includes among its members, Elihu Root and James Brown Scott of the United States, Baron Makino of Japan, Dr. Drago of Brazil, Alessandor Alvarez of Chili, Fernando Prida of Spain, Francisco de la Barra of Mexico. From such men we may reasonably expect an intelligent service to the great cause of international peace, because